



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/025,133	02/17/1998	KOJI FUKUNAGA	862.2136	9220

5514 7590 12/03/2001

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ELAMIN, ABDELMONIEM I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2001

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/025,133

Applicant(s)

Fukunaga et al

Examiner
Abdelmoniem Elamin

Art Unit
2182



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25-37, and 39-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25-37, and 39-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2782

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

i. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,2, 4-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25-37 & 39-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borg et al, US. Pat. No. 4,635,275 in view of Clark, GB. Pat. No: 2255877.

3. As to claims 1, 4, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22 & 50, Borg discloses a data communication method between a data terminal and an external source [*abstract*], said method comprises the steps of :

selectively setting a data transfer method to be performed from a plurality of data transfer methods including synchronous and a synchronous transfer methods [*abstract, col. 2, lines 14-20*];

wherein the data transfer method is set by the data terminal in accordance with the data transfer method set in the external source [*see abstract, col. 2, lines 1-32*], *however*, Borg does not explicitly teach performing bi-directional communication between said data terminal and external source.

Art Unit: 2782

Clark teaches performing bi-directional communication between a terminal device [computer 1 of Fig. 1] and a target device [2 of Fig. 1] to retrieve interface configuration information stored at the target device [see Fig. 1, page 7, lines 1-14, page 8, lines 1-13]. The terminal device then makes use of this information to match the configuration of the interface of the target device [page 8, lines 9-13].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of combine Borg and Clark, because this would allow the terminal device to configure its receiver and transmitter to communicate with the target device in the desired format prior to transmission/reception of data.

4. As to claim 2, 13, 18 & 23, it is a matter of design choice to have the data transfer methods further including a PULL model... and an isochronous model which uses an isochronous transfer,

5. As to claims 5 & 6, it is a matter of design choice to have the serial bus being based on IEEE 1394 or universal bus standards.

6. As to claims 7, 9-11 & 16, having the host provides image data is believed to fall within the scope of Borg.

Art Unit: 2782

7. As to claims 8 & 21, having the target device to form a visible image, based on the image data, on a print medium, is well known in the art.

8. As to claim 25, 36, 41, 46 & 51 Clark teaches transferring a procedure signal for the transfer of data to said host and target devices [abstract, pages 2-4].

9. As to claims 26, 37, 42 & 47, it is well known in the art to have a PUSH buffer model in which the host device writes data into the target device and a PULL buffer model in which said target device reads data from said host device¹.

10. As to claims 27, 28, 39, 43, 44, 48 & 49 Clark teaches the host device sets the data transfer method corresponding to the target device, based on the procedure signal [abstract, pages 2-4].

11. As to claims 29 & 30, it is a matter of design choice to have the serial being a bus based on IEEE 1394 or universal bus standards.

12. As to claims 31, 33, 34, 35 & 40, transmitting image data to the target device is believed to fall within the scope of Borg.

¹ See Merley, previously cited reference. [col. 3, lines 40-44, col. 18, lines 64,65].

Art Unit: 2782

13. As to claims 32 & 45, having the target device to form a visible image, based on the image data, on a print medium, is well known in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelmoniem I. Elamin whose telephone number is (703) 305-3804, or via e-mail: abdelmoniem.elamin@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Lee, can be reached at (703)305-9717.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238 (After-final)

(703) 746-7239 (Official)

(703) 746-7240 (Non-Official/Draft)

Application/Control Number: 09/025,133


Page 6

Art Unit: 2782

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (receptionist).*

Abdelmoniem I. Elamin

November 19, 2001



THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100